

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

November 21, 2000

Maricopa Association of Governments Office
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room,
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair	Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
ADOT: Dan Lance	Mesa: Jeff Martin
*Avondale: William Bates	Paradise Valley: Tom Martinsen
Buckeye: Joe Blanton	Peoria: David Moody
Chandler: Bryan Patterson	RPTA: Ken Driggs
Gilbert: Tami Ryall	Scottsdale: Michelle Korf for John C. Little
Glendale: Jim Book	*Surprise: Ellis Perl
*Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	*Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis	
Glen Kephart, Tempe	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

Regional Bicycle Task Force: Eric Iwersen, Tempe	Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Street Committee: Grant Anderson, Glendale	Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
ITS Committee: Jim Book	Telecommunications Advisory Group:
	Jim Hull

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Eric Anderson, MAG	Bryan Jungwirth, RPTA
Chuck Eaton, ADOT	Richard Metz, Coalition
Bob Antilla, RPTA	for Arizona Bicyclists
Stuart Boggs, MAG	Pat McDermott, Regional
Dawn Coomer, MAG	Bicycle Task Force, Chandler
Dean Giles, MAG	Dennis Smith, MAG
Don Herp, Phoenix	Ed Stillings, FHWA
Sarath Joshua, MAG	Paul Ward, MAG

1. Call to Order

Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

2. Recommendation of Projects for CMAQ Funding in FY 2006 of the FY 2002-2006 MAG

Transportation Improvement Program

Turning to the first order of business, Vice-Chairman Tevlin introduced Eric Anderson of MAG who told the Committee that this special meeting was a follow up to the regular meeting of October 31, 2000. Mr. Anderson briefed the Committee on the purpose and format of the meeting. He stated that the purpose was to review the final staff recommendations for CMAQ funding in FY 2006 of the MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Anderson told the group that they would hear short presentations by representatives from each of the MAG modal and technical committees.

Mr. Anderson introduced Dean Giles of MAG. Mr. Giles indicated that the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee recommendation for air quality projects was to fund the projects as requested. He mentioned that three projects were recommended to be programmed consistent with current funding levels: \$960,000 for the purchase of PM-10 certified street sweepers, \$910,000 for the Travel Reduction Program, and \$135,000 to implement the Capitol Rideshare Program. Mr. Giles noted that the proposed budget of \$722,692 for the Regional Rideshare Program represented an increase over the amount programmed for FY 2005. The staff recommendation is to fund the program at the existing level of \$660,000 and to conduct a performance evaluation for the Regional Rideshare Program prior to increasing funding levels.

Vice-Chairman Tevlin asked how many people were currently participating in the Rideshare program. Ken Driggs responded that ridesharing occurred in two ways. Either through the program, or informally by people pairing up on their own. While tracking participation through the program was relatively simple, tracking informal ridesharing was not. Mr. Driggs did note that there were currently 175 van pools in operation.

Mr. Giles noted that RPTA had requested \$353,000 for the Valley Telework Program. The staff recommendation is to program the project as a joint MAG/RPTA project at the existing \$300,000 and to evaluate the program for future resource allocation. He also noted that RPTA had requested an increase to \$365,000 for the Summer Ozone Campaign. The staff recommending is not to fund the Summer Ozone Campaign project for FY 2006. Vice-chairman Tevlin asked why they were recommending zero funding. Mr. Giles replied that there had been no ozone violations in the past three years in the valley. He also noted that the program was unfunded in the TIP for 2002 through 2005.

Vice-Chairman Tevlin then introduced the Chairman of the Regional Bicycle Task Force, Patrick McDermott, who briefed the Committee on the recommended bicycle projects. Mr. McDermott urged the Committee to increase funding above the \$3 million recommended by MAG staff. He noted that the projects being recommended were continuations or extensions of the existing regional bicycle system and the focus now was dealing with bottlenecks. Mr. McDermott stated that his committee felt that all the requested projects included in the list were worthy of funding. Vice-chairman Tevlin asked if the three projects being

recommended for funding represented the committee's recommendation. Mr. McDermott replied that they were the MAG staff recommendation, not the committee's. He urged the Committee to fund all eight projects recommended by the Task Force.

The next presentation was on ITS projects and was given by Jim Book, Chairman of the ITS Committee. Mr. Book briefed the Committee on the ten projects recommended by the ITS Committee. He noted that several projects, including the Gilbert Road/US 60 project, were joint projects involving more than one jurisdiction. Mr. Book told the Committee that he was proud of the fact that the ITS Committee had received several joint projects since they demonstrated the benefits of inter-jurisdictional cooperation on ITS issues.

The next presentation was on pedestrian projects. Reed Kempton, representing the Pedestrian Working Group, briefed the Committee on the recommended projects. He noted that the Working Group had met on October 16th and had heard presentations by the requesting agencies on the proposed projects. Mr. Kempton told the Committee that the Working Group had used various criteria to rate projects including cost effectiveness and impacts to low income populations. Based on the Working Group's review they would like to see five projects funded rather than just three as recommended by MAG staff.

Vice-chairman Tevlin noted that there were no Phoenix projects included in the recommendations. Mr. Kempton replied that Phoenix was requesting fund to construct two pedestrian overpasses, one of which would be at 25th Street and Camelback Road. He pointed out that the Working Group did not feel that pedestrian bridges were a good use of CMAQ funds. Citing the Camelback Road project request, Jeff Martin questioned using public funds to benefit a private development, the Fashion Park.

Vice-chairman Tevlin noted that the developer would be sharing the cost of the pedestrian bridge. He also noted that public infrastructure such as streets, always benefitted abutting land uses. Bryan Patterson ventured that an alternative to the bridge might be a pedestrian traffic signal. Mr. Kempton noted that a traffic signal existed about one eighth of a mile from the proposed bridge location. He went on to observe that Arizona State University had constructed a pedestrian bridge over University Drive but most people still crossed at street level prompting the University to install a traffic signal.

Michele Korf felt that the bridge addressed safety issues but wondered if it addressed air quality. Vice-chairman Tevlin replied that the bridge would allow for a safe crossing of Camelback Road by pedestrians. He went on to state that people currently drove from one development to the other since it was difficult to cross Camelback Road on foot. With a bridge, he felt these people would walk rather than drive, thus reducing vehicle emissions.

Tom Martinsen asked if the Lincoln Drive multi-use path listed in the bicycle project list was also reviewed by the Pedestrian Working Group. Dawn Coomer replied that this project had been reviewed by the Bicycle Task Force, not the Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Mr.

Martinsen stated that he thought it was MAG's policy to have CMAQ projects reviewed by all the modal committees. Paul Ward replied that Paradise Valley's application identified the Lincoln Drive facility as a multi-use path, not as a pedestrian path, even though it was predominately a pedestrian facility. He observed that the project was not ranked by the Bicycle Task Force since it did not fit their criteria. Mr. Martinsen told the Committee that Paradise Valley identified sidewalk projects as recreation facilities to address bicycle/pedestrian liability. Mr. Kephart was bothered by the fact that the Pedestrian Working Group did not hear a presentation by a representative from Phoenix at their meeting of October 16th. He felt that a study should be undertaken to see what would be the best solution for addressing pedestrian needs in this area. Mr. Kephart asked if there was sufficient time to send this back the Working Group for their consideration?

Eric Anderson noted that the next meeting of the Transportation Review Committee would be on December 12th. He thought there might be time to take it back to the Working Group prior to that meeting. Jeff Martin felt that a 50/50 public/private funding split should be required with the developer picking up the private share of the project cost. Vice-chairman Tevlin replied that a 70/30 public/private split was used on these projects. Don Herp indicated that Phoenix would be willing to accept a 30 percent local share on this project with the money coming from the developer. Mr. Martin noted that the majority of the pedestrian traffic using the bridge would come from the restaurant and movie theater in the development.

Tom Martinsen made a motion that the projects be returned to the Pedestrian Working Group for review. There was no second to the motion.

Paul Ward briefed the Committee on street projects which had been submitted for CMAQ funding. He noted that 26 projects had been submitted by various MAG member agencies for FY 2006. Of these, six were found to be ineligible for funding under the program. Mr. Ward related to the group how each Street Committee member had individually ranked the projects. He also noted that the local and federal costs shown in the budget reflected the MAG staff recommended local cost and not necessarily the Street Committee recommendation. Mr. Ward told the group that the Street Committee had recommended funding all twenty projects while MAG staff had recommended funding eight of the submitted projects.

Chris Plumb voiced his concern that the projects submitted by the County were taking a hit. He asked why the funding reduction had not been spread over all the projects. Mr. Ward agreed that the County projects assumed a 50/50 match so they shouldn't take a hit.

Vice-chairman Tevlin next introduced Jim Hull, representing the Telecommunications Committee. Mr. Hull told the Committee that the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was only recommending one project for CMAQ funding, implementation of the regional community Wide Area Network (WAN) study. Mr. Hull told the Committee that a Request for Proposals for consultant services for the study had been issued. The study, which will

be completed in a year, will look at partnership opportunities between agencies seeking to develop ITS infrastructure.

Tami Ryall asked what was the status of MAG's video conferencing project. Mr. Hull replied that MAG's system was approximately 70 percent complete when work was halted due to the insolvency of the vendor. He told the group that the contract with the vendor had been cancelled based on their inability to complete the work and a new RFP had been issued to hire a vendor to complete the installation and startup of the new teleconferencing system.

Heidi Pahl told the Committee that proposals were due from vendors by November 28, 2000. Tami Ryall asked how much money had been spent on the project to date. Mr. Hull replied that a little less than \$1.5 million had been spent on the project. Ms. Ryall asked what the basis of the projected \$2 million WAN implementation budget. Mr. Hull said the budget was a best guess based on analysis of the technology. Ms. Ryall stated that she would be uncomfortable with the budget until the WAN study had been completed, especially in light of the problems affecting the video conferencing project.

Mr. Hull pointed out that the problems with the video conferencing project were related to the vendor's bankruptcy, not to problems with the project scope. Ms. Ryall indicated that she was concerned over the incremental increases that occurred in the video conferencing project that she believed resulted from an unclear idea of the project's scope. Glen Kephart noted that he did not like budget placeholders. Dennis Smith related to the Committee the discussion that had occurred at the Management Committee retreat. He told the group that at that retreat, Phoenix City Manager Frank Fairbanks had wondered how many times the streets would need to be torn up to install new telecommunications infrastructure. Mr. Smith noted that the wide area network was a priority of the Management Committee.

The next presentation was by Brian Jungwirth representing the Regional Public Transit Authority (RPTA). Mr. Jungwirth briefed the Committee on the Valley Connections Light Rail project, the Scottsdale mass transit MIS, and proposed bus and van pool purchases. He pointed out that the proposed bus replacements were for new CNG fueled buses to replace the diesel buses currently included in the RPTA's bus fleet. Jeff Martin felt that the \$8 million being requested for transit projects was not enough and should be increased. Mr. Jungwirth noted that the proposed LRT budget assumed a start of service in 2006. Ken Driggs noted that the LRT project budget assumes a 50/50 federal/local split.

Vice-chairman Tevlin asked if there was any more discussion. There being none, he asked for a motion. Ken Driggs made a motion to approved the MAG staff recommendation as presented. There was no second to the motion. Glen Kephart asked how the MAG staff had determined the funding total for pedestrian projects. Eric Anderson noted that the funding total was \$448,000 less than last year's request, but he also pointed out that last year's request was for three years while the current request was only for FY 2006. Mr. Anderson told the Committee that MAG staff had looked at historical allocation, the intent of the CMAQ program, as well as available funding. He noted that staff had attempted to balance

out funding between the modes but indicated that there was no hard and fast formula for allocating money.

Glen Kephart stated that he felt the Committee would be sending the wrong message if they allocated less than one percent of the CMAQ funds to pedestrian projects. Tami Ryall echoed Mr. Kephart's comments and said that his concerns were also applicable to bicycle project funding. Vice-chairman Tevlin wondered where the Committee could find the money to boost bike and pedestrian funding. Jim Book suggested using funding allocated to the ADOT projects since he felt the agency had other funding sources they could draw upon. Eric Anderson noted that any reduction in ADOT funds would have to come from the I-10 collector-distributor project. Chris Plumb noted that there were \$4.9 million in ADOT projects in the 2006 program. Paul Ward summarized the requested ADOT projects. Mr. Ward noted that bicycle/pedestrian projects were receiving substantially more than in prior years though less than they did last year. Vice-chairman Tevlin asked if the Val Vista and Deer Valley projects requested by ADOT could be funded out of STP money. Dan Lance noted that these were cosponsored projects and that money would have to come from arterial projects to replace reallocated CMAQ funds.

Brian Patterson asked about the origin of the STP list. Mr. Anderson stated that the list was cooperatively developed by MAG, ADOT and RPTA. Bryan Patterson observed that a number of freeway projects remained to be built. He felt that the cost of fiber optic cable could be absorbed by these projects. Mr. Anderson replied that the freeway construction budgets included the cost of installing conduit, but not of the cabling that would be installed in the conduit.

There being no further discussion, Vice-chairman Tevlin called for a motion. Tami Ryall made a motion to accept the MAG staff recommendations with the following amendments: to reallocate \$2.4 million in I-17/Deer Valley funding and \$2.4 million in left turn lanes at Val Vista and accelerating two light rail preliminary design projects to utilize any uncommitted FY 2002 funds.. The reallocated funds to be apportioned as follows: \$3.8 million to fund all eight projects recommended by the Bicycle Task Force, \$1.66 million reallocated to projects recommended by the Pedestrian Advisory Group, \$.6 million on a 50/50 match to pave dirt roads, \$.2 million on a 50/50 match to turn lanes. Tom Martinsen offered an additional amendment of \$.5 million for Paradise Valley multi-use path. Mr. Martinsen then seconded the amended motion.

Vice-chairman Tevlin asked if there was any discussion on the motion. Mr. Kephart expressed concern that the motion had the effect of jumping two projects over the Camelback Pedestrian Bridge project requested by Phoenix. Jeff Martin suggested adding \$.4 million into transit. Mr. Kephart pointed out that the Camelback project would get people out of their cars by making it easier to walk than drive across Camelback Road. Mr. Martinsen offered a second amendment of Ms. Ryall's motion adding \$.5 million each for the Paradise Valley and Tempe projects. Ms. Ryall accepted the amendment to her motion and there being no further discussion the Vice-chairman called for a vote. The vote was eleven in

favor with Glen Kephart and Dan Lance opposed.

3. Next Meeting Date

Turning to the last order of business, Vice-Chairman Tevlin told the Committee that the next regular meeting will be held on December 12th at 10:00 a.m. in the Saguaro Room, 2nd floor, MAG offices.

There being no other business, the Vice-Chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:33 a.m.